

(In answer to Doctor Almon.)

As to whether the Kirk party had a fair share in the management of the Institution, he would say, that the Academy was established for the general good; and he did not see why a party should come in while others were in the management who had subscribed large sums of money, and deprive them of their influence which their exertions entitled them to.

(In answer to Mr. Johnston.)

Even if the grant were permanent, and the institution in its present inefficient state, parties would wish the Bill to pass. He thought that the object of the party in opposition was to continue the Academy in its inefficient state until the grant should cease and then to declare it had done no good, and even a Grammar School would not be obtained. Mr. McC was not paid for the half-year's services which were alluded to. The excuse for non payment was, that he had not served for six months. His objection, that his contract was not for six months, was stated to the opposite party. Last year Mr. R. felt convinced that Mr. McKenzie did not feel the hostility which was expected, and he waited on him, and requested him to join hand in hand for the common good. He met others at Mr. McKenzie's and that gentleman seemed inclined to let matters continue just as they were. The only thing that he would agree to was, that the Legislature should be petitioned for an additional £100. Doctor Martin undertook to draw up the petition, and subsequently brought it to Mr. Ross's office. When it was shown to him, Mr. R. he found it was a bad request for the sum, without stating any reasons, and he declared the attempt in that shape, useless. Dr. Martin said that Mr. McKenzie would sign the petition as he had promised to do so, but that none else of his party would. Mr. McKenzie did refuse to collect money for the Academy, going as an excuse, the story of Mr. Christie being set up to oppose the lower branches.

(In answer to Mr. Stewart.)

The passage of the Bill would not deprive the people of Pictou of the Grammar School. It would not be right to take part of the £200 appropriated for the school, and apply it to the payments of the debts of the Institution. The people he believed would subscribe to meet them. Many of the Highlanders were good men, they appreciated their Bibles and would study it, although they did not attend to other knowledge. A talented teacher, in the place of Dr. McCulloch, a stranger to parties might do good. Some he believed preferred Mr. Christie's Grammar School because they thought was more competent to teach. The number of pupils in his school was from 20 to 30.

(In answer to Dr. Almon.)

If Mr. McDonald did not give satisfaction, the Trustees were not altogether to blame, they did not wish to appoint him, he was chosen at the desire of others, to please the Kirk party. (In answer to Mr. Johnston.) Doctor McCulloch always had assistance, at the time spoken of, in his private lectures, and he believed that the assistance was necessary. He lectured at the time to relieve himself from pecuniary embarrassment, he was ready to lecture on Natural Philosophy at the Academy if an assistant was procured. (In answer to Mr. Uniacke.) To divide the institution into two Grammar schools would be to waste the public money. He did not say that the Highlanders did not desire education, he was the descendant of a Highlander himself, and had been very eager to get the benefit of good education and regretted that he had not had the opportunity.

(In answer to Mr. Fraser.)

Mr. Ross retired from the bar, and the Rev. Mr. Fraser was informed, that if he wished to make any remarks he was at liberty to do so.

(In answer to Mr. Johnston.)

Mr. Fraser said that he was sorry to hear one intimation, that a statement respecting Mr. M. McCulloch had been made for the purpose of misleading. He would remark on that, that Mr. George Smith himself gave it as his opinion, that the engagement was for six months bona fide. He was not present at any meeting of trustees in which Mr. McKenzie used insulting language, but it seemed to be forgotten that the party to which he belonged had been insulted, one time they were told they had covered themselves with infamy, these were the precise words. He insisted that the new trustees never agreed to pay Mr. Blanchard's debt. That debt had been liquidated from the funds of the Institution; when parties had subscribed to the Academy, the money so collected became part of its funds. He could speak for himself he had never given consent to the payment of that debt absent been given by some to the payment of a small part of it, but he had not so assented. Immediately when that sum was paid, a demand was made for the balance. As to an engagement with Dr. McCulloch, with the understanding that he was not to lecture on Natural Philosophy, the Kirk party had nothing to do with any such engagement. They would never agree to give £200 a year to a man who was not able

to perform the duties of his situation. Many other statements had been made for the answer of which there was not suitable time.

Mr. Ross assured the House that he had not more time for preparation than the Rev. Gentleman.

Mr. Fraser. Were you not in Halifax when Dr. McCulloch was last here?

Mr. Ross. Yes.

Mr. Fraser. Was there nothing about the Bill stated then?

Mr. Ross. He never gave me the slightest intimation of it.

Mr. Fraser. It is very extraordinary that men should petition to have £200 a year taken from themselves.

Mr. Ross. They petition to take it from a place where it is doing no good.

Hon. Mr. Stewart. 500 names are attached to the petition in favour of the Bill, at what time was it put in course of signature?

Mr. Ross. On Friday last. Twenty friends met, and resolved to petition, four copies of the petition were sent in different directions for signatures; which signatures were all attached to the petition sent to the house.

Hon. N. Uniacke. Did all who subscribed understand it?

Mr. Ross. I believe that not one subscribed who did not understand it, and very many of them had subscribed to the funds of the Academy.

The house adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25.

After considerable routine, business was transacted, Hon. Mr. Lawson moved that the Pictou Bill be taken up.

Hon. Mr. McTavish moved that any new witnesses who desired to be heard on the Bill, should be then heard at the bar.

Dr. Martin said that he previously had no intention of addressing that house on the subject; although he had accompanied the Rev. Mr. Fraser from Pictou to assist in opposing the passage of the Bill, he was not the authorized agent of any party there. His name had been mentioned by Mr. Ross at the Bar of the house, and it might be due to Mr. McKenzie, that he should offer some explanation. The subject also was one of importance, and those who could give any information should not hold back. His information on the subject could not be extensive, he was not long in the country, he arrived at that ever-memorable year in which the Act passed which gave the Kirk party some share in the management of the Pictou Academy. It was difficult, if not impossible, for any man, however plain, of moderate attainments, to remain in that district, and not, sooner or later imbibe the spirit of party on this subject. He felt this influence as well as others, but he was happy on the present occasion, when the interests of a large community were affected, to be able to free himself from all party prejudice, and to stand before the honourable house unbiassed by religious and political party feelings,—anxious to live in peace and to forward those measures which were calculated for the good of the whole. His duty was not to follow the remarks of the gentlemen who had spoken, at the other side; and he had no disposition to enter into any critical analysis of his commentary on the documents before the house; but he was there ready to answer any questions relative to the Academy far as his information would allow him to do so.

(In answer to Dr. Almon.)

Dr. Martin said he recollected when Mr. Ross called on Mr. McKenzie with the petition which had been mentioned. Mr. McKenzie objected to sign it,—it contained implied censure on him and his friends, and aimed at the removal of the lower branches from the Assembly. (In answer to Mr. Wilkins.) There were many causes of the Academy's inefficiency. One cause was, the prevalence of the party spirit in the county of Pictou; also the existence of a board of management in which were two parties that could not amalgamate, and one of which almost invariably rejected what the other proposed, and a further reason was, the hostility which was manifested by one party to the lower branches. (In answer to Dr. Almon.) There were apprehensions that the £100 now appropriated to the lower branches, would be taken from these. (In answer to Mr. Lawson.) The reason he had for this fear was, that the majority of the Trustees were uniformly against the introduction of those classes, and complained that they had destroyed the Academy. £400 a year was not a sufficient sum to pay all the professors, as the academy was arranged at present.

(In answer to Mr. Uniacke.)

The removal of Dr. McCulloch would not improve the lower branches,—if the £100 for the pay of the

teachers were continued he did not see what effect the removal would have on the department.

(In answer to Mr. Johnston.)

The hostility of the old Trustees to the lower branches since 1832, was exhibited by their disposition on many occasions. He was not a Trustee himself and could not speak personally. One fact was, that when a teacher of the Kirk party was over those branches most of the children of the opposite side were taken away,—when one of their own part was over it, he was well supported. In a great degree the hostility was to the persons teaching, not to the class. He believed that they would withdraw the £100 from those branches if they could, but it caused a feeling of the fees of Dr. McCulloch's son. The Kirk party patronised the teacher of the opposite side who was over the lower classes, as well as they might be expected to do; there were not many of that party in the town of Pictou, the majority were of that party. Not many of the Kirk party in the country sent their children into the town to these classes,—since the appointment of the teacher of that party, there were not many children sent, he believed about fifteen were going to the school at one time. There were nine or ten now,—he was not prepared to say whether these were not all the children of that party, in Pictou, who wanted that education. He did not know of any young men of that party being under Dr. McCulloch's tuition since 1832.

(In answer to Doctor Almon.)

He himself would hesitate to send his child to a school where the teacher was known to absent himself from his duties. He believed that there were but few young men of the Kirk who were prepared to follow the higher branches, and whose intended profession called for such education. That was a reason why no students of that party were at the Academy. (In answer to Mr. Johnston.)

The mischief of removing the £200, and thus breaking up those higher branches, as regarded the Kirk party, would be prospective. He did not know that much mischief would result within the four years to which that grant was limited by law. That party also considered that the instructions were not what were wanted,—that was one objection.

(In answer to Mr. Lawson.)

A chief objection made by those who opposed the lower branches, was, that they took the funds from the other classes. (In answer to Mr. Johnston.)

The reason why so little had been subscribed by the Kirk party was, that the majority of the trustees resented every attempt of the minority in the management of the Institution. One instance of this was, when the majority endeavoured to reduce the tuition fees for the lower branches, on account of the teacher receiving £100 of the public money, the majority unanimously resisted the attempt. The fees were sufficiently low, only that the grant enabled a reduction, and many persons were not competent to pay higher fees. The removal of the higher branches might occasion some loss to those of the Kirk party within the next four years; some young men might be prepared to enter in that time; but not many of any party would be in it during that period.

(In answer to Mr. Stewart.)

The want of students would be caused by the character which the institution had acquired, and the spirit which existed against it, and the want of unanimity in the board of trustees, and the absence of the branches of Natural Philosophy.

(In answer to Mr. Lawson.)

One proof of the partiality of the trustees, was the support which they gave the school when Mr. Blanchard taught, and the removal of that support when another teacher was there. All parties, he believed, supported Mr. Blanchard. Mr. Christie opened his school some weeks before the school attached to the Academy was resumed.

(In answer to Mr. Uniacke.)

Party spirit was less violent than formerly, except on particular occasions. The objection was not to an Anti-burgher Professor, or to a Provincial one composed to a professor from Scotland, other things being the same. Trustees chosen from parties at a distance might enable matters to go on better. The party to which he belonged had thought of a plan, which would please themselves: they would wish to have the Academy on the same principles as the Scotch Academies, which comprised the higher and lower classes.

(In answer to Mr. Johnston.)

No part of the £100 appropriated to the lower branches had been taken from these by the friends of the Academy. He did not exactly know how Mr. McCulloch had been paid. He believed it was chiefly by subscription. The Kirk party he believed did not pay, and were not asked.

Here Mr. Ross put several interrogatories to Dr. Martin, respecting the petition which had been drawn out for an additional £100, and which Mr. McKenzie